

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 442 610

RC 022 497

AUTHOR Howley-Rowe, Caitlin
TITLE Evaluation of AEL CSRD Electronic Forums.
INSTITUTION AEL, Inc., Charleston, WV.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED),
Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 2000-05-00
NOTE 25p.
CONTRACT RJ96006001
PUB TYPE Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Evaluative
(142) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Discussion Groups; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary
Education; *Information Services; *Listservs; *Technical
Assistance; User Satisfaction (Information)
IDENTIFIERS Appalachia Educational Laboratory WV; *Comprehensive School
Reform Demonstration Program; Kentucky; Service Delivery
Assessment; *Service Utilization; Tennessee; Virginia; West
Virginia

ABSTRACT

Since early 1998, AEL, Inc., has been assisting state departments of education in Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia in the implementation of the federally funded Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) program. As part of this assistance, AEL established two types of electronic networks to link school staff at CSRD sites, external facilitators, and site researchers assisting with school formative evaluation. CSRDnet is a Web-based electronic communication forum providing moderated discussion and conferencing capabilities for external facilitators and CSRD sites. Participants are assigned to discussion groups based on their state and the CSR model they are implementing. The second electronic medium consists of listservs in Kentucky, Virginia, and West Virginia. As with CSRDnet, a moderator facilitates discussion and information sharing, and participants include external facilitators and staff at CSRD sites. Evaluations of these networks included analyses of CSRDnet activity and listserv activity during January-March 2000 and surveys of client satisfaction completed during 1999. Of 96 individuals responding to questions about the forums, 55 were located in Kentucky. Results suggest that CSRDnet and the listservs are underutilized. Survey respondents were satisfied with the format, timeliness, and efficiency of CSRDnet and the knowledge and preparedness of AEL staff, but were less satisfied with the usefulness of CSRDnet to their work and its relevance to their particular situations. Appendixes include the client satisfaction survey. (SV)

Evaluation of AEL CSRD Electronic Forums

**May 2000
Caitlin Howley-Rowe**

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

**AEL, Inc.
P.O. Box 1348 • Charleston, WV • 25325
800-624-9120**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE



Evaluation of
AEL CSRD Electronic Forums

May 2000
Caitlin Howley-Rowe

AEL, Inc.
P.O. Box 1348 • Charleston, WV • 25325
800-624-9120

AEL's mission is to link the knowledge from research with the wisdom from practice to improve teaching and learning. AEL serves as the Regional Educational Laboratory for Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia. For these same four states, it operates both a Regional Technology in Education Consortium and the Eisenhower Regional Consortium for Mathematics and Science Education. In addition, it serves as the Region IV Comprehensive Center and operates the ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.

Information about AEL projects, programs, and services is available by writing or calling AEL.



Post Office Box 1348
Charleston, West Virginia 25325-1348
304-347-0400
800-624-9120
304-347-0487 (fax)
aelinfo@ael.org
<http://www.ael.org>

© 2000 by AEL, Inc.

This publication is based on work sponsored wholly or in part by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under contract number RJ96006001. Its contents do not necessarily reflect the views of OERI, the Department, or any other agency of the U.S. government.

AEL is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
Federal CSRD Legislation	1
AEL CSRD Program	1
Electronic Networks	2
METHODS	3
FINDINGS	4
Log of CSRD Activity	4
1999 Annual Satisfaction Survey	5
Listserv Activity	10
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	11
Conclusions	11
Recommendations	12
REFERENCES	13
APPENDIXES	
A: 1999 Annual CSRD Client Satisfaction Survey, Local School District Version	
B: Completed Evaluation <i>Standards</i> Checklist	

INTRODUCTION

Federal CSRD Legislation

School improvement is increasingly viewed as an ongoing and comprehensive process. Recent legislation has encouraged the adoption of such a view: In 1994, Congress revised the regulations to allow schools where 50% or more students qualify for free or reduced lunch to use their Title I funds for whole school improvement rather than for programs targeted solely at specific groups of students (American Institutes for Research, 1999). Later, as part of the FY 98 Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations Act (PL 105-78), and again in 1999, Congress designated \$150 million to promote comprehensive school reform. Much of these Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) funds flowed through states via a competitive grant process to schools and districts interested in implementing schoolwide, comprehensive reform. Of these monies, \$120 million came from Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title I funds allocated by formula to states to allow current Title I schools to adopt comprehensive school reform models. The Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE) allocated \$25 million to flow to states by school-age population to allow non-Title I schools to implement reform programs. In addition, \$4 million was allocated to Regional Educational Laboratories to assist states, districts, and schools in the implementation of the CSRD program.

According to the New American Schools (NAS) organization (2000), which has developed several of the schoolwide reform models adopted by CSRD-funded schools, "the success or failure of the CSRD Program has enormous implications for public education in the country's poorest neighborhoods." Title I of the ESEA of 1965, which provides federal funding for disadvantaged students, is due for congressional reauthorization in the year 2000. "To encourage research-based and replicable best practices," Congress may reauthorize Title I based upon lessons learned from CSRD (NAS, 2000).

AEL CSRD Program

AEL, Inc. began assisting the four states in its region, Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia, in early 1998 as part of the effort to support state departments of education in their implementation of CSRD. Assistance to these state departments of education has included consultation and technical assistance concerning the development of procedures and criteria to select competitively the schools that would receive assistance under this program. Also, AEL has collaborated with state departments of education in developing procedures for guiding interested districts and schools through the process of assessing their needs, selecting among research-based reform models, or choosing to develop their own research-based comprehensive program. Also in collaboration with state departments, AEL has developed and provided workshops and technical assistance to schools and districts preparing their applications for grants under this program. Such workshops have included information about candidate reform programs, assistance with compiling aggregate components to create comprehensive programs for those not opting to purchase a model, and guidance regarding how to evaluate the effectiveness of programs implemented.

Another significant component of AEL's CSRD program is an Academy for External Facilitators. External facilitators are individuals assigned by state departments of education to assist schools implementing CSRD-funded reform initiatives. AEL's Academy offers training and support as external facilitators execute five challenging roles in school reform: using the knowledge base on effective practices leading to improved student performance; modeling collaboration and joint problem-solving; collecting, organizing, and analyzing school data to make decisions; brokering and recommending resources; and acting as agents of change in contexts in which facilitators possess no authority to direct change.

Another facet of AEL's CSRD program has been to assist states and schools evaluate the effectiveness of programs implemented with CSRD funds. Participating CSRD schools are required to evaluate their progress toward the nine CSRD implementation criteria (evaluation itself being one of the nine criteria).

AEL CSRD services have additionally included a research symposium on the CSRD program and schoolwide reform and several independent and collaborative research efforts.

Electronic Networks

Yet another AEL CSRD goal is to develop electronic networks of schools, districts, and external facilitators involved in CSRD. The purpose of such networks is to provide participants with opportunities to share experiences and information, connect with resources, and access relevant information. Moreover, the electronic networks provide AEL a venue for offering ongoing support to CSRD school sites and external facilitators. These networks are also intended to provide AEL with information regarding contributions to successful implementation of CSRD programs for the purpose of informing the wider education community.

AEL has established two types of electronic networks in which staff at CSRD sites, external facilitators, and site researchers assisting with school formative evaluation may participate. CSRDnet is a web-based electronic communication forum providing moderated discussion and conferencing capabilities for external facilitators and CSRD sites. Participants are assigned to several discussion groups based on the CSR model they are implementing and the state in which they work. A form is provided for participants to enter information about themselves and their undertakings; a similar form is provided for participants to complete profiles of their schools. In addition, a moderator posts articles and links relevant to CSR.

The second electronic medium consists of listservs in three of AEL's four states (Kentucky, Virginia, and West Virginia). As with CSRDnet, a moderator facilitates discussion and information sharing, and participants include external facilitators and staff members at CSRD sites.

This evaluation report is intended to provide AEL CSRD staff with a description of the extent to which and the ways in which CSRDnet and the three listservs has been used between January 5

and March 10, 2000. It is also intended to provide information to staff as they plan modifications to the electronic forums.

METHODS

Several methods are used to evaluate AEL's CSRD electronic networks. CSRDnet activity is logged weekly into a SPSS database. The number of log-ins, entries, and files accessed are counted each week; staff and moderator activity is then subtracted from weekly counts to render a more accurate account of external facilitator and CSRD site participation on CSRDnet. Data collection via this method began January 5, 2000.

A second source of information is data from the 1999 survey of client satisfaction with AEL's CSRD services (see Appendix A), administered to state department, local school district and local school personnel who have availed themselves of AEL CSRD services. This survey is intended to assess clients' degree of satisfaction with a variety of characteristics of the services they have received. Respondents are requested to rate their level of satisfaction with 12 characteristics of the services they obtained using a 5-point Likert-type scale. In addition, respondents are asked three open-ended questions which seek to identify suggestions for improving current services, clients' needs for the coming year, and ways AEL CSRD services have been useful.

Two versions of the survey are administered: one to state department partners, and the other to local school district and school faculty. Items are tailored to address the AEL CSRD services each role group might have accessed. Data reported in this account are drawn from the version administered to local school district and school personnel.

In addition, several demographic items are included on the local district and school version of the satisfaction survey. Role, state of employment, school level, and number of years in education are among the demographic characteristics solicited.

The satisfaction survey was intended to be a population survey of local district and school personnel who had received technical assistance or consultation with AEL staff about CSRD during 1999. Contact information for district and school personnel participating in the Formative Evaluation Process for School Improvement (FEPSI) are maintained in a database; 127 schools in AEL's region receive CSRD funding and have been listed in the database. Of the 127, 96 also participate in FEPSI. This database also includes contact information for individuals from five schools not funded by CSRD which are nonetheless participating in FEPSI, and 30 CSRD-funded schools not electing to participate in FEPSI. The database contains data on a total of 131 schools.

However, participant lists with complete contact information were not collected at every AEL CSRD workshop or meeting conducted during 1999. To assist in creating a more accurate sample, project staff requested from each state department of education in AEL's region lists of participants who had attended workshops or technical assistance sessions collaboratively developed and/or presented by AEL and the SEAs during 1999. Similarly to the FEPSI database, these participants were local school and district employees. Missing contact information from such participant lists was then sought by evaluation staff via the Quality Education Data (QED) database purchased by AEL providing information about local district educators in the region.

Information was not available from the QED database for every individual, however. This is likely because QED data were collected during the prior school year, and some educators may have been employed elsewhere.

A total of 422 surveys was mailed February 23, 2000. Three weeks later, a reminder card was sent to those participants who had not yet returned their completed surveys to AEL evaluation staff. A second reminder card was mailed four weeks following the first. By May 2000, a total of 222 surveys had been completed and returned, for a return rate of 53%.

Section 7d of the instrument asks respondents to rate their satisfaction with 12 characteristics of CSRDnet on a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied). Demographic data allows disaggregation of findings. In addition, respondents' replies to three open-ended questions about AEL's CSRD services were analyzed with regard to the electronic forums.

Third, listserv activity is monitored and stored in an e-mail application. Postings from participants are then coded and tabulated. Data reported in this account were collected between January 1 and March 10, 2000.

FINDINGS

Log of CSRD Activity

Over the course of the first 18 weeks of the year 2000, CSRDnet activity was logged into an SPSS database. Log-ins, entries, and files accessed are counted each week; staff and moderator activity is then subtracted from weekly counts to present a more precise account of external facilitator and CSRD site participation on CSRDnet.

The mean number of log-ins per week minus staff and moderator log-ins was 7.17, with a standard deviation (SD) of 6.44. The number of weekly log-ins by clients varied from none to 20. The mean number of entries made or edited by clients was 2.17 (SD 3.60), and the mean number of files accessed weekly by clients was 3.50 (SD 4.66). Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 1.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics for CSRDnet Activity

Item	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
Total log-ins	18	11	45	21.78	9.60
Total client log-ins	18	0	20	7.17	6.44
Total entries	18	0	39	9.11	11.71
Total client entries	18	0	12	2.17	3.60
Total files accessed	18	0	16	4.44	5.09
Total files accessed by clients	18	0	16	3.50	4.66

Standard deviations were relatively high, suggesting that the number of log-ins, entries, and files accessed varied substantially across weeks. Analysis of the data file indicated that the heaviest activity occurred during the week of January 5-12, 2000, with a total of 20 client log-ins, 12 client entries, and 6 files accessed by clients. The week of February 10-16, 2000, was the second most active week on CSRDnet, with 20 client log-ins, 8 client entries, and 2 files accessed by participants. The least client activity occurred during the week of April 27-March 3, 2000. No clients logged into CSRDnet during this week.

1999 Annual Satisfaction Survey

Two-hundred twenty-two individuals engaged in CSRD reform efforts completed and returned the local district and school faculty version of the 1999 annual satisfaction survey. Of these, 96 (43%) responded to at least one of the items concerning their satisfaction with CSRDnet. More than half (57.3%) of such respondents work in Kentucky, and more than half (51.1%) are employed in elementary schools. Table 2 shows in which states respondents are employed. Table 3 provides information on the school levels at which respondents work.

Table 2
Respondent Location

State	N	Percent
Kentucky	55	57.3%
Tennessee	9	9.4%
Virginia	14	14.6%
West Virginia	18	18.8%

Table 3
Respondent School Level

School Level	N	Percent
Elementary	48	51.1%
Middle	11	11.7%
High School	4	4.3%
Multiple levels	31	33.0%

Respondents played a variety of roles in schools. Nearly a third (30.2%) identified themselves as school administrators, and more than a fourth (27.1%) as external facilitators. Table 4 summarizes the roles held by respondents.

Table 4
Respondent Role

Role	N	Percent
School administrator	29	30.2%
External facilitator	26	27.1%
School staff	20	20.8%
Local school district central office staff	16	16.7%
Other	4	4.2%
CSR model developer/staff	1	1.0%

Nearly two-thirds (65.6%) of respondents reported having more than 20 years of experience in education. Respondents varied widely in the number of years they had spent working in their current location. Tables 5 and 6 display descriptive statistics concerning respondents' years of experience in education and working in their current sites.

Table 5
Years Employed in Education

Years in education	N	Percent
1-3 years	1	1.0%
4-10 years	4	4.2%
11-20 years	28	29.2%
More than 20 years	63	65.6%

Table 6
Years Working in Current Location

Years working in current location	N	Percent
Less than 1 year	9	9.5%
1-3 years	30	31.6%
4-10 years	26	27.4%
11-20 years	16	16.8%
More than 20 years	14	14.7%

Overall, respondents expressed less satisfaction with characteristics of CSRDnet than with characteristics of any other AEL CSRD service. Of the 222 respondents, only 96 (43%) replied to items about CSRDnet, using a 5-point Likert-type scale with anchor points of 1 (very dissatisfied) and 5 (very satisfied). Respondents reported the highest amount of satisfaction with the preparedness (4.00, SD 1.00) and knowledge (3.99, SD 1.03) of the CSRDnet service providers, and the format of the medium (3.97, SD 1.02). Also highly rated was respondents' satisfaction with the timeliness (3.95, SD 1.06) and the efficiency (3.93, SD 1.04) of the service delivery. Table 7 presents mean ratings of satisfaction with 12 characteristics of CSRDnet.

The usefulness of CSRDnet (3.57, SD 1.10), the extent to which it met respondents' needs (3.61, SD 1.00), and its relevance to respondents local or state situations (3.68, SD 1.06) received the lowest mean ratings. The relatively large standard deviations suggest, however, that there is some divergence among respondents about their levels of satisfaction.

Table 7
Mean Ratings of Satisfaction with CSRDnet Characteristics

Item	N	Mean	SD
Preparedness of service provider	93	4.00	1.00
Knowledge of service provider	92	3.99	1.03
Format of service delivery	95	3.97	1.02
Timeliness of service delivery	94	3.95	1.06
Efficiency of service delivery	95	3.93	1.04
Overall satisfaction with this AEL CSRD service	96	3.77	1.03
Applicability of information received	95	3.77	0.99
Adequacy of materials provided	94	3.76	1.04
Completeness of information provided	94	3.73	1.01
Relevance of service to your state/local situation	94	3.68	1.06
Extent to which service met your needs	93	3.61	1.00
Usefulness of service to your work	95	3.57	1.10

Analyses of variance (ANOVA) were conducted to determine if differences in mean ratings of satisfaction with CSRDnet among respondents were statistically significant. This test of statistical significance allows determinations of whether differences are likely due to variations occurring by chance or due to actual differences in the groups under study. ANOVAs were used here to detect statistically significant differences among respondents based on their role, school level, state, years of experience in education, and years of experience in their current location. Five statistically significant differences were found at the .05 level of statistical significance (see Table 8).

Table 8
Statistically Significant Differences in Satisfaction with CSRDnet

Item		df	F ratio	F probability	Significant differences by group
By role group	Relevance of the service to your state/local situation	5 88	2.42	.04	N/A
	Adequacy of materials received	5 88	3.46	.01	N/A
By school level	Efficiency of service delivery	3 89	2.70	.05	multiple levels > high school
	Completeness of information provided	3 88	2.90	.04	multiple levels > high school
	Knowledge of service provider	3 86	3.25	.03	multiple levels > high school

Two statistically significant differences were detected among role groups in terms of their mean ratings of satisfaction with the relevance of CSRDnet to their local or state situations and the adequacy of materials provided. Tukey post hoc tests were conducted to determine among which of the role groups the statistically significant differences were located. However, the post hoc tests could not be performed because at least one role group contained too few cases.

Cross tabulation of means for these items gives some indication of where differences may lie (see Table 9). External facilitators appeared more satisfied (4.04, SD 0.96) with the relevance of CSRDnet to their local and state situations than did local school district central office staff (3.27, SD 1.16), "other" respondents (3.33, SD 1.15), and school staff (3.35, SD 1.04). External facilitators (4.08, SD 0.84) and respondents identifying their roles as "other" (4.75, SD 0.50) rated their satisfaction with the adequacy of materials provided about or through CSRDnet more highly than did school staff (3.32, SD 1.20) and local school district central office staff (3.33, SD 0.90).

Three statistically significant differences were found among respondents working at different school levels. Tukey post hoc tests revealed that respondents who worked at multiple school levels were more satisfied with the efficiency of CSRDnet, the completeness of information provided about or through CSRDnet, and the knowledge of the service provider than were respondents working at the high school level.

Table 9
Satisfaction with Relevance of CSRDnet and Adequacy of Materials by Respondent Role

Role	Relevance of service to your state/local situation			Adequacy of materials provided		
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD
Local school district central office staff	15	3.27	1.16	15	3.33	0.90
School staff	20	3.35	1.04	19	3.32	1.20
School administrator	29	3.90	0.98	29	3.90	1.01
CSR model developer/staff	1	2.00	N/A	1	2.00	N/A
External facilitator	26	4.04	0.96	26	4.08	0.84
Other	3	3.33	1.15	4	4.75	0.50

Cross-tabulations indicated that many respondents who functioned at multiple school levels tended to be respondents whose normal work responsibilities afford them more mobility than classroom teachers throughout the work day (see Table 9). Local school district staff (32.3%) and external facilitators (27.4%) make up more than half of those who reported working at multiple school levels. School administrators made up 19.4% of respondents functioning at multiple school levels.

Three open-ended questions were posed on the survey. Respondents were asked to describe in what ways CSRD services had been useful, suggestions for improving services, and what assistance they needed for the coming year. For the purposes of this report, responses pertaining to CSRDnet were identified, coded, and tabulated.

Eleven responses to the question about ways AEL CSRD services had been useful concerned CSRDnet. Interestingly, seven of the 11 replies were from external facilitators. Seven replies indicated that CSRDnet provided helpful information. One such participant wrote that the forum contained a "wealth of resources and contacts," while another reported that it "has provided internet addresses of some excellent sites." Two of the seven replies also noted that the information on CSRDnet was timely. One, however, noted a difficulty: "[The moderator] has a ton of information on the internet, but it is hard to drive the forces of a school and stay on the internet."

Three responses indicated that the training received about CSRDnet had been beneficial. One reply simply conveyed that CSRDnet had been useful.

Nine replies about CSRDnet were given to the item soliciting suggestions to improve AEL's CSRD services. Two comments indicated that CSRDnet had not been accessible during their training sessions, implying that training would have been strengthened had the site been available. The

remaining responses were idiosyncratic (see Box 1). These comments indicate issues of internet access, time, the voluntary nature of medium usage, site of training, format, technical difficulties, and limited information.

Box 1
Idiosyncratic Suggestions for Improving CSRDnet

"Two of our schools are not online so CSRDnet is not working for them."
 "CSRDnet is a wonderful concept, but so far I find it time consuming and have quit visiting the site . . . The training probably needs to be longer for novices like myself."
 "I should have taken advantage of the CSRDnet more. The few times I used the web I enjoyed the experience and learned a great deal."
 "Onsite delivery of services and training . . . [on] CSRDnet."
 "The CSRDnet could be made more user friendly."
 "CSRDnet was hard to access in the beginning. Passwords wouldn't work. Used principal's name. It was fixed, but there wasn't much on our model."
 "CSRDnet would have been beneficial."

Five responses to the query about what assistance respondents needed for the coming year pertained to CSRDnet. Two replies concerned training: One suggested simply offering more training on CSRDnet, while the second requested onsite training about the forum. One respondent wanted "even more relevant, research based articles on CSRDnet." Another suggested that AEL "continue to seek ways to enhance the use of the CSRDnet." Continuing the forum and allowing "non-CSRD schools to access the web site to help them choose effective reform models" was yet another suggestion.

Listserv Activity

Activity on the three CSRD listservs was monitored beginning January 1, 2000, and stored in an e-mail utility. Messages from the moderator and participants were counted. Content of postings from participants was coded and tabulated.

Thirty-nine messages were posted to the Kentucky listserv, only 13 (33%) of which were from participants. Five messages (13%) debated the use of scripted lessons. Three e-mails (8%) pertained to a particular reform model, while two (5%) addressed methods to keep "the fire [of reform] burning." Three messages (8%) expressed thanks to the moderator for information.

Thirty-six messages were contributed to the Virginia listserv. Eleven (31%) of these were from participants, five (14%) of which dealt with the use of scripted lessons. Two e-mails (6%) expressed thanks to the moderator, and two (6%) announced new e-mail addresses. One message (3%) requested technical assistance, and another (3%) discussed a reform model.

The West Virginia listserv had the fewest postings. Twenty-nine messages were contributed, only two (7%) by participants. One (50%) concerned the use of scripted lessons, the other (50%) a reform model.

The moderator offered ongoing discussion prompts and responded to participant contributions in a timely manner in all three listservs. The moderator also provided informative links and quotes at least once weekly.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

CSRNet appears to be a forum which is currently underutilized. Participation of those with access to the medium has been minimal. Few files are accessed and fewer entries posted. On the other hand, AEL staff use CSRNet more frequently.

Respondents to the annual survey are satisfied with the format, timeliness, and efficiency of CSRNet, and the knowledge and preparedness of AEL staff with regard to the forum. They are less satisfied with the usefulness of CSRNet to their work, the degree to which it meets their needs, and its relevance to their particular situations.

External facilitators may be more satisfied with the relevance of CSRNet and the adequacy of materials they have received through or about the medium than other role groups. This may not be surprising, given the facilitators' in-depth involvement with CSRNet undertakings.

Respondents working at multiple school levels are more satisfied with the efficiency of CSRNet, the completeness of information provided, and the knowledge of AEL CSRNet providers than are those working at the high school level. One reason for this disparity may be that respondents working at multiple levels have more job flexibility and physical mobility during their work day to find time to access CSRNet. Another explanation may be that the organizational structure of high schools does not allow staff the time or latitude to explore the forum.

Although there is little information to be gained from responses to open-ended questions on the annual survey with regard to CSRNet, a few tentative conclusions may be drawn. For instance, external facilitators may have opportunities to use the forum more than others, and therefore may find it more useful as well. Also, there may be many reasons CSRNet is underutilized; respondents' comments, though few and idiosyncratic, suggest several of these, including lack of internet access, lack of time, the voluntary nature of CSRNet usage, limited training opportunities, the site of training, format, and technical difficulties.

Most activity on the three CSRNet listservs is generated by the moderator. Of the limited discussion among participants via this medium, about half dealt with scripted lessons. Further, the Kentucky and Virginia listservs are slightly more active than the West Virginia listserv.

Recommendations

CSRD staff may want to explore further the reasons CSRDnet and the listservs are underutilized, as well as suggestions that participants and nonparticipants have to improve their use. This might take the form of questionnaires, interviews, or online prompts. In addition, staff might consider other means by which to connect CSRD sites to each other to share information and resources.

Similarly, staff should consider strategies that focus on enhancing the participation of those working at the high school level on CSRDnet. One such strategy might be to provide reform model or state information available on the forum in hard copy form to participants, citing CSRDnet as the source should they decide to access it for further details.

Staff should continue to offer training on the use of CSRDnet and consider offering training to schools. Providing training onsite at CSRD schools may be a strategy for AEL staff to explore with state departments of education. External facilitators could perhaps assist with such a training effort.

CSRD staff should continue to support the use of CSRDnet by external facilitators. One strategy might be to continue offering sessions on the medium at the annual External Facilitators Academy or at state gatherings.

If schools selected to receive CSRD funds are indeed the lowest performing, they may not find accessing CSRDnet to be a priority at this time, despite its abundance of information. CSRD staff might consider techniques such as offering incentives for participation and hosting virtual meetings in chat areas to promote the usefulness of CSRDnet as an information source and a medium for connecting people with similar concerns. Likewise, incentives might be offered to promote listserv usage, particularly in West Virginia.

REFERENCES

- American Institutes for Research. *An educators' guide to schoolwide reform*. <http://www.aasa.org/Reform> (July 16, 1999).
- Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (1994). *The program evaluation standards: How to assess evaluations of educational programs* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- New American Schools. *New American Schools and the Education Commission of the States: CSRD implementation project 1999*. <http://naschools.org/csrd/index.html> (January 27, 2000).

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A:

**1999 Annual CSRD Client Satisfaction Survey,
Local School District Version**

1999 Survey of Client Satisfaction with AEL's CSRD Services
Local School District Version

Our records indicate that you received a service or services from AEL to assist in your efforts to implement the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) program. We are interested in continuously improving our services. Please help us do this by answering the following questions. Your responses will remain confidential and anonymous, so feel free to answer candidly.

1. Please check the option that best describes your role.

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local school district central office staff | <input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive school reform model developer/staff |
| <input type="checkbox"/> School staff | <input type="checkbox"/> External facilitator |
| <input type="checkbox"/> School administrator | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify) _____ | |

2. In which state do you work? Please check one.

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Kentucky | <input type="checkbox"/> West Virginia | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify) _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Tennessee | <input type="checkbox"/> Virginia | |

3. At what school level do you work? Check all that apply.

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Elementary | <input type="checkbox"/> Jr. High | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify) _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Middle | <input type="checkbox"/> High | <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable/available |

4. Please check the option that best represents the number of years of experience in education you have had.

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than 1 year | <input type="checkbox"/> 4-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> More than 20 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1-3 years | <input type="checkbox"/> 11-20 years | |

5. Check the option that best represents the number of years you have worked in your current location.

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than 1 year | <input type="checkbox"/> 4-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> More than 20 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1-3 years | <input type="checkbox"/> 11-20 years | <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable/available |

6. Please briefly describe your role in CSRD. _____

7. Listed below are services offered by AEL during 1999. Please **check the services you received**. Then, using the scale provided, **rate your level of satisfaction** with characteristics listed below of the AEL CSRD service(s) you indicated having received.

a. ☐ Workshop or consultation to assist with your school's or district's preparation to apply for CSRD funds

1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Not Applicable

Circle One

- | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| a. Format of service delivery | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| b. Efficiency of service delivery | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| c. Timeliness of service delivery | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| d. Relevance of service to your state/local situation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| e. Usefulness of service to your work | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| f. Adequacy of materials provided | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| g. Extent to which service met your needs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| h. Completeness of information provided | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| i. Knowledge of service provider | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| j. Preparedness of service provider | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| k. Applicability of information received | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| l. Overall satisfaction with this AEL CSRD service | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |

b. _____ Workshop or consultation to assist with your school's or district's implementation of CSRD-funded school reform model

1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Very	Somewhat	Neutral	Somewhat	Very	Not
Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied		Satisfied	Satisfied	Applicable

Circle One

a. Format of service delivery	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
b. Efficiency of service delivery	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
c. Timeliness of service delivery	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
d. Relevance of service to your state/local situation	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
e. Usefulness of service to your work	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
f. Adequacy of materials provided	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
g. Extent to which service met your needs	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
h. Completeness of information provided	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
i. Knowledge of service provider	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
j. Preparedness of service provider	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
k. Applicability of information received	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
l. Overall satisfaction with this AEL CSRD service	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

c. _____ Assistance with evaluation of implementation of your CSRD-funded school reform program

1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Very	Somewhat	Neutral	Somewhat	Very	Not
Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied		Satisfied	Satisfied	Applicable

Circle One

a. Format of service delivery	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
b. Efficiency of service delivery	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
c. Timeliness of service delivery	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
d. Relevance of service to your state/local situation	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
e. Usefulness of service to your work	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
f. Adequacy of materials provided	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
g. Extent to which service met your needs	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
h. Completeness of information provided	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
i. Knowledge of service provider	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
j. Preparedness of service provider	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
k. Applicability of information received	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
l. Overall satisfaction with this AEL CSRD service	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

d. _____ CSRDnet

1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Very	Somewhat	Neutral	Somewhat	Very	Not
Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied		Satisfied	Satisfied	Applicable

Circle One

a. Format of service delivery	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
b. Efficiency of service delivery	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
c. Timeliness of service delivery	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
d. Relevance of service to your state/local situation	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
e. Usefulness of service to your work	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
f. Adequacy of materials provided	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
g. Extent to which service met your needs	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
h. Completeness of information provided	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
i. Knowledge of service provider	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
j. Preparedness of service provider	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
k. Applicability of information received	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
l. Overall satisfaction with this AEL CSRD service	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

e. _____ Other (please specify) _____

1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Very	Somewhat	Neutral	Somewhat	Very	Not
Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied		Satisfied	Satisfied	Applicable
					Circle One

- | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| a. Format of service delivery | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| b. Efficiency of service delivery | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| c. Timeliness of service delivery | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| d. Relevance of service to your state/local situation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| e. Usefulness of service to your work | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| f. Adequacy of materials provided | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| g. Extent to which service met your needs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| h. Completeness of information provided | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| i. Knowledge of service provider | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| j. Preparedness of service provider | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| k. Applicability of information received | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| l. Overall satisfaction with this AEL CSRD service | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |

8. Please list 2 or 3 specific ways the CSRD services you have received from AEL have been useful to you.

9. Please describe how the CSRD assistance you received could have been improved.

10. Describe the kinds of CSRD assistance you would like to receive this year.

Thanks for taking the time to complete this survey. Your cooperation is appreciated! Please return to Caitlin Howley-Rowe, AEL, Inc., P. O. Box 1348, Charleston, WV 25325.

APPENDIX B:

Completed Evaluation *Standards* Checklist

Checklist for Applying the Standards

To interpret the information provided on this form, the reader needs to refer to the full text of the standards as they appear in Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, *The Program Evaluation Standards* (1994), Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.

The Standards were consulted and used as indicated in the table below (check as appropriate):

Descriptor	The Standard was addressed	The Standard was partially addressed	The Standard was not addressed	The Standard was not applicable
U1 Stakeholder Identification	x			
U2 Evaluator Credibility	x			
U3 Information Scope and Selection		x		
U4 Values Identification	x			
U5 Report Clarity	x			
U6 Report Timeliness and Dissemination	x			
U7 Evaluation Impact	x			
F1 Practical Procedures	x			
F2 Political Viability	x			
F3 Cost Effectiveness	x			
P1 Service Orientation	x			
P2 Formal Agreements	x			
P3 Rights of Human Subjects	x			
P4 Human Interactions	x			
P5 Complete and Fair Assessment	x			
P6 Disclosure of Findings	x			
P7 Conflict of Interest	x			
P8 Fiscal Responsibility	x			
A1 Program Documentation	x			
A2 Context Analysis	x			
A3 Described Purposes and Procedures	x			
A4 Defensible Information Sources	x			
A5 Valid Information	x			
A6 Reliable Information	x			
A7 Systematic Information	x			
A8 Analysis of Quantitative Information	x			
A9 Analysis of Qualitative Information	x			
A10 Justified Conclusions	x			
A11 Impartial Reporting	x			
A12 Metaevaluation	x			

The Program Evaluation Standards (1994, Sage) guided the development of this (check one):

- ☐ request for evaluation plan/design/proposal
☐ evaluation plan/design/proposal
☐ evaluation contract
☒ evaluation report
☐ other: _____

Name Caitlin Howley-Rowe Date 5/19/00
Caitlin Howley-Rowe
 (signature)

Position or Title Research Associate

Agency AEL, Inc.

Address P.O. Box 1348 Charleston, WV 25325

Relation to Document Author
 (e.g., author of document, evaluation team leader, external auditor, internal auditor)



U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



NOTICE

Reproduction Basis



This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.



This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").

EFF-089 (3/2000)